



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,910	02/20/2004	Eric Peyrucain	I7307.04104	5420

24257 7590 01/27/2005

STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP  
1615 L STREET, NW  
SUITE 850  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

HOLZEN, STEPHEN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3644

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,910

Applicant(s)

PEYRUCAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen A. Holzen

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/20/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

#### Arrangement of the Specification

2. As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or  
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

#### Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the

Art Unit: 3644

specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.

- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.  
  
Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.
- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
  - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
  - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may

Art Unit: 3644

point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).

Art Unit: 3644

- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant has used the word "consistency" however the examiner thinks that applicant meant to use the word "accuracy". Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant has used the word "furthermore comprise". The examiner would recommend using a different phrase, because this phrase is not commonly used. The examiner suggests, "further comprising" or "further comprise".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
7. Claims 1-10 provide for the use of non-precision approach device, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it

Art Unit: 3644

merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

8. Re – Claim 1: The phrase “wherein the following series of successive steps is carried out interactively and automatically” does not clearly set forth the scope of the claim. This terminology does not meet the standards used in method claims, where method claims spell out specific steps used in order to define the invention. This limitation is narrative in form and thus indefinite.

9. Re – Claim 1: Steps a) – c) are not actually steps. They are narrative in form and only describe how the invention is used, opposed to what the invention does, or the steps required to complete the invention. The claims are indefinite because they do not conform to appropriate method step claims.

10. Re – Claim 2: This claim does not express alternative limitations. The applicant has attempted to use the phrase “at least some of”, however the proper and accepted format is “at least one of”. The claim is indefinite therefore because the applicant has

Art Unit: 3644

not expressed the limitations in an alternative form, and thus has created uncertainty and ambiguity in regards to what is claimed.

11. Claims 1-10 are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Below are some of the errors the examiner has found. However this list is not inclusive, and the applicant is required to review the claims carefully and remove all 112 2<sup>nd</sup> issues.

a. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the aircraft's two flight management computers" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

b. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the aircraft's two multimode landing assistance receivers" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

c. The terms "correct functioning" in claim 2 and "functioning correctly" in claims 4-7 are relative terms that render the claim indefinite. The terms "correct functioning" and "functioning correctly" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. How does a computer function correctly? What determines



Art Unit: 3644

when the function is correct vs. incorrect? How many errors can the computer make before it's "incorrect". Does correct mean "accurate calculations?"

d. Re – Claim 6: The phrase "high uncertainty" is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. The term "high uncertainty" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

e. Re – Claim 7: Claim 7 recites the limitation "it comprises" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

f. Re – Claim 8: If the applicant intends to employ "means plus function" language in this claim, the proper form is "means for". The applicant has used "means of" language, which is not covered by 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph.

g. Re – Claim 8: The words "particular" and "appropriate" are relative terms, that have not be defined in the specification and does not clearly set forth the claim limitations.

h. Re – Claim 8: The phrase "second means for selecting" lack antecedent basis because there is no "first means for selecting".

- i. Re – Claim 9: The word “usually” is a relative term that has not been defined in the specification in a manner that clearly sets forth the meaning of the term.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harenberg Jr. et al (3,789,356). Harenberg disclose a method to assist the piloting of an aircraft during a landing phase that operates the following steps simultaneously: verifying a plurality of condition to the correct function of aircraft equipment (see Col. 3, lines 55-60), selecting an appropriate approach (see Col. 3, lines 1-6), wherein the conditions verified in step a) comprise verifying the correct function of the aircrafts sensors (see Col. 1, lines 58-61), whereby the monitor displays the correct functioning of the auto pilot (see Abstract lines 2-4), where the fault monitoring system verifies the function of flight computers (see Col. 6, lines 21-23), at least two inertial reference system (see Col. 1, lines 58-61), at least one assisted approach mode function is functioning correctly (see Col. 6, lines 21-23), an altitude value of the aircraft (see Col. 2, lines 34-36), integrity and precision of the aircraft location (see Col. 6, lines 21-23),

Art Unit: 3644

position of the aircraft (see abstract), and further comprises various approach category determined by the fault assessment device and displayed to the pilot (Col. 2, lines 34-37).

14. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harenberg Jr, et al (3,789,356). Harenberg Jr discloses a first means for verifying functioning of a plurality of equipment and the integrity and precision of the measurements coming from the equipment (see Col. 1, lines 57-67), and a second means for selecting an appropriate approach category from a plurality of different categories (see Col. 2, lines 34-37), and displaying the approach category selected by the second means (15), wherein the display screen is a primary screen for piloting the aircraft and wherein the display means present the approach category in a zone of the said primary piloting seen (see Abstract and Col. 2, lines 15-19).

### ***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. R. C. Sebern (3,439,321) discloses a display and means for assessing the integrity of aircraft sensors and flight conditions for landing and take off and further discloses displaying options for the pilot who faces adverse landing conditions.

Art Unit: 3644

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 703-308-2484. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703 305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sah



MICHAEL J. CANOY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER